

either that it is possible to identify that species or the necessity to designate a neotype for it. This is a matter of time.

The participants in the All-Union meeting decided to submit their arguments against Lane & Ziegler's proposal in the autumn of 1980. This paper is being prepared by Barskov and Alekseev and will be supported by all Soviet conodontologists. Meanwhile, Academician O.S. Vjalov and Drs Alekseev, Khalymbadzha, Kononova, Goreva and Starostina join me in asking the Commission to defer a decision on Lane & Ziegler's proposal.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE
INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE
REGARDING ICHNOTAXA. Z.N.(S.)1973

(see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 11-14; vol. 37, pp. 6-10)

By G. Hahn (*Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge,
Marburg/Lahn, BRD*)

In *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 6-10 Drs Bromley and Fürsich commented on the proposals to introduce rules governing names of ichnotaxa into the Code. They discuss all the aspects that are favourable to this proposal. Let me now make one or two adverse remarks.

The first comment concerns the uniformity of zoological taxonomy. Up till now we have had only one taxonomy, applicable to all groups of animals, recent as well as fossil. Now we are discussing the introduction of ichnotaxa, and also of parataxa for special groups of fossils. If this tendency continues we shall perhaps end up with a special taxonomy for domestic animals, another for protozoa, others for ichnotaxa and parataxa, and so on. The Animal Kingdom will then be split into several taxonomically independent units and its homogeneity will be endangered. This is a very real apprehension: Bromley & Fürsich at the end of their comment unequivocally demand the independence of ichnotaxonomy from 'orthotaxonomy', the two not competing in priority.

Secondly, we do not have exact definitions for either ichnotaxa or parataxa. What will be the status of the impression of a fossil medusa in future? Is it an impression of a normal fossil (thus entering into 'orthotaxonomy') or is it a resting trace (thus entering into ichnotaxonomy)? Some specialists will prefer the first interpretation, others perhaps the second one. The introduction of ichnotaxa and parataxa will thus not help to stabilise nomenclature but the reverse. Uncertainty as to which taxonomy to use will endanger the uniformity of our taxonomic base. I should therefore prefer to renounce the attempt to regulate ichnotaxonomy and parataxonomy by the Code. If this cannot be achieved, we should at least try to preserve the priority of 'orthotaxonomy' over ichnotaxonomy and parataxonomy.

Reply by the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Professor Hahn's disquiet at the proposals concerning ichnonomenclature and paranomenclature is understandable. The Commission must, however, face the fact that parallel taxonomies, reflected in parallel nomenclatures,

exist in a number of groups where particular parts or organs can be classified and named, but where there is a mismatch between their taxonomy and nomenclature on the one hand, and the 'orthotaxonomy' and 'orthonomenclature' of the animals themselves. The Code at present provides for these cases, not on a general basis or group by group, but name by name: the Law of Priority applies where a part of an animal, or (before 1931) the work of an animal is named before the animal itself. But if a given part or a given work relates indiscriminately to several 'orthotaxa', then, even though that part or work can be classified only in its own taxonomy, its name must either be forced into the nomenclature of the animals themselves (even though it cannot be known to which of several species or genera it corresponds), or it must take the name of some species or genus of animals given an equal state of ignorance. This is insupportable on both logical and pragmatic grounds.

The Commission's proposals therefore seek to deal with a situation that already exists (and, in the case of paranomenclature, since long before the 1905 *Règles* were written); they seek to remove the anomaly whereby names proposed in ichnonomenclature before 1931 are available, but not those proposed after 1930; and they seek to provide orderly channels of communication between specialists using these nomenclatures and those using 'orthonomenclature'. They should also help the scientist who has to use all three (or any two of them) in particular areas of his work.